

JUL 30 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 remain in the application.

The Rejections:

In the Office Action dated May 1, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tan et al. (US 6,354,120 B1).

Referring to Claim 1, the Examiner stated that Tan teaches a method for security checking or transport of persons by an elevator installation comprising the steps of:

1. generating at least one authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator (e.g., vehicle) installation (see abstract; column 1, lines 25-27 an lines 41-43; column 3, lines 15-24 of Tan);
2. detecting the at least one authentication signal with a mobile authentication device (see abstract; 1, lines 25-27 an lines 41-43; column 3, lines 10-24 of Tan);
3. checking the at least one authentication signal with at least one person reference (column 3, lines 25-36 of Tan);
4. in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference, providing at least one identification code (column 3, lines 38-44 of Tan);
5. detecting the at least one identification code with a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation (column 3, lines 38-44 of Tan); and
6. assigning to the identification code one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at the recognition device by the person (column 2, line 64 through column 3, line 67 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 2, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: including supplying the authentication device with electrical power from at least one energy source external to the authentication device (see abstract; column 1, lines 25-27 an lines 41-43; column 3, lines 15-24 and lines 25-29 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 3, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: including selecting as the authentication signal a biometric signal being one of a fingerprint, a hand geometry, a facial

profile, an iris pattern, a retinal scan, a thermogram, a smell, a voice, a signature and pressing of a button (column 3, lines 25-29 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 4, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: including checking whether at least one user reference exists for the detected identification code (column 3, lines 25-36 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 5, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: including comparing the input travel destination with at least one access authorization for generating one of a control signal and an alarm signal (column 3, line 46 through column 4, line 19 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 6, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: including comparing the input travel destination with a list of travel destinations of an access authorization for generating one of a control signal and an alarm signal (column 3, line 46 through column 4, line 19 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 7, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches a system for security checking or transport of persons by an elevator installation comprising:

- a mobile authentication device adapted to be carried by a person, said authentication device detecting an authentication signal of the person and checking whether said authentication signal corresponds with a person reference, said authentication device generating an identification code when said authentication signal corresponds to said person reference (column 3, lines 25-44 of Tan);

- a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation for detecting said identification code (column 3, lines 38-44; column 4, line 61 of Tan); and

- a checking device connected to said recognition device for assigning to said identification code one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at said recognition device by the person to generate a control signal for the elevator installation (column 3, line 46 through column 4, line 19 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 8, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said authentication device includes a sensor (e. g., reader modules) for generating said authentication signal in the presence of the person (column 3, lines 34-36 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 9, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said sensor is a camera for detecting at least one of a fingerprint, a hand geometry, a facial profile, an iris profile, a retinal scan and a signature of the person (column 3, lines 25-44 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 10, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said sensor is one of a thermal camera for detecting a thermogram of the person, a smell sensor for detecting a smell of the person, a microphone for detecting a voice of the person, and a button for detecting pressing of the button by the person (column 3, lines 25-44 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 11, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said authentication device is adapted to be powered by an external energy source (see abstract; column 1, lines 25-27 and lines 41-43; column 3, lines 15-24 and lines 25-29 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 12, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said authentication device includes a transmitting and receiving unit and said recognition device includes a transmitting and receiving unit for communicating said identification code (column 2, line 64 through column 3, line 13 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 13, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said authentication device includes a data store for storing said person reference and compares said person reference with said authentication signal to generate said identification code (column 3, lines 38-44 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 14, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said authentication device includes a data store for storing said identification code prior to detecting said authentication signal (column 1, lines 59-62 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 15, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said recognition device includes input means for receiving said input travel destination from the person (column 1, lines 59-62 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 16, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing said predefined travel destination (column 1, lines 59-62 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 17, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing a user reference and compares said user

JUL 30 2007

reference with said identification code to generate said control signal (column 1, lines 5942; column 3, line 46 through column 4, line 19 of Tan).

Referring to Claim 18, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing an access authorization and compares said access authorization with one of said predefined travel destination and said input travel destination to generate said control signal (column 1, lines 5942; column 3, line 46 through column 4, line 19 of Tan).

The Response:

The claimed invention relates to a method for a double security check in front of an elevator installation. For doing so, the person to be checked carries a mobile authentication device similar to a credit card and which may comprise a sensor, a processor and a memory with a person reference. The person to be checked performs a first authentication test by taking a biometric signal with the sensor, the processor compares the biometric signal with the person reference and issues an identification code if the authentication test is positive. The identification code is an RF signal which is detected by a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation. The elevator installation comprises a processor and a memory with a user reference. The processor compares the identification code with the user reference. If this second identification test is positive, a control signal is issued to an elevator control in order to transport the person to a travel destination.

Tan relates to a vehicle locking system wherein an authentication code is transmitted from a remote electronic key to an authentication module in the vehicle. Upon receiving the authentication code, the authentication module generates an authentication signal to an electronic lock module for generating a lock release signal. A lock mechanism enables use of the vehicle in response to the lock release signal.

Regarding Claim 1, The Examiner stated that Tan teaches "detecting the at least one authentication signal with a mobile authentication device (see abstract; 1, lines 25-27 and lines 41-43; column 3, lines 10-24 of Tan)". As shown in Fig. 3 of Tan, the key 40 communicates the authentication code to the door lock module 30 that is connected to the bus system 34 within the vehicle. Also connected to the bus 34 is an ignition lock control module 32 that is responsive to

16715

the authentication code to enable the ignition switch. Obviously, neither the door lock module nor the ignition lock control module is the claimed "mobile authentication device" since both modules are fixed to the vehicle.

The Examiner also stated that Tan teaches checking the at least one authentication signal with at least one person reference (column 3, lines 25-36 of Tan). The Tan electronic key 40 generates two communication protocols, one for enabling vehicle entry and the solenoid 18 to be energized, and a more secure protocol for communicating with the electronic system to enable starting the vehicle. However, Tan has no "person reference" against which the authentication code is checked. Applicants' method utilizes a person reference to identify the authentication signal as coming from a person associated with the signal. Anyone can operate the Tan key 40 to gain entry to and start the vehicle.

The Examiner stated that Tan teaches in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference, providing at least one identification code (column 3, lines 38-44 of Tan). Tan does not mention a "person reference" in the passage cited by the Examiner. The door module 30 sends an encrypted authentication message solely in response to the authentication code.

The Examiner stated that Tan teaches assigning to the identification code one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at the recognition device by the person (column 2, line 64 through column 3, line 67 of Tan). There is absolutely no discussion of "a predefined travel destination" or "an input travel destination" input at the recognition device by the person. The only signals generated by the Tan vehicle locking system are one for enabling vehicle entry and another for enabling starting of the vehicle.

Referring to Claim 4, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: including checking whether at least one user reference exists for the detected identification code (column 3, lines 25-36 of Tan). There is no "at least one user reference" mentioned in Tan.

Referring to Claim 5, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: including comparing the input travel destination with at least one access authorization for generating one of a control signal and an alarm signal (column 3, line 46 through column 4, line 19 of Tan). There is no "input travel destination" mentioned in Tan.

thermal camera, a smell sensor, a microphone, or a button for detecting pressing of the button by the person in Tan.

Regarding Claim 13, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said authentication device includes a data store for storing said person reference and compares said person reference with said authentication signal to generate said identification code (column 3, lines 38-44 of Tan). There is no mention of a "person reference" or a comparison with a person reference in Tan. The cited passage refers only to an authentication message sent by the door module 30.

Regarding Claim 15, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said recognition device includes input means for receiving said input travel destination from the person (column 1, lines 59-62 of Tan). There is no travel destination input by the person with the Tan electronic key 40.

Regarding Claim 16, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing said predefined travel destination (column 1, lines 59-62 of Tan). Since there is no travel destination, Tan does not have the recited data store.

Referring to Claim 18, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing an access authorization and compares said access authorization with one of said predefined travel destination and said input travel destination to generate said control signal (column 1, lines 59-62; column 3, line 46 through column 4, line 19 of Tan). There is no discussion of "a predefined travel destination" or "an input travel destination" input at the recognition device by the person.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner cited Hikita et al. (US 6,747,546 B1) as disclosing a data communication transponder and communications system employing it (see Title), and Tiernay et al. (US 7,016,311 B2) as disclosing a multiple protocol transponder (see Title). Applicants reviewed these references and found them to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in the rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

16715

thermal camera, a smell sensor, a microphone, or a button for detecting pressing of the button by the person in Tan.

Regarding Claim 13, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said authentication device includes a data store for storing said person reference and compares said person reference with said authentication signal to generate said identification code (column 3, lines 38-44 of Tan). There is no mention of a "person reference" or a comparison with a person reference in Tan. The cited passage refers only to an authentication message sent by the door module 30.

Regarding Claim 15, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said recognition device includes input means for receiving said input travel destination from the person (column 1, lines 59-62 of Tan). There is no travel destination input by the person with the Tan electronic key 40.

Regarding Claim 16, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing said predefined travel destination (column 1, lines 59-62 of Tan). Since there is no travel destination, Tan does not have the recited data store.

Referring to Claim 18, the Examiner stated that Tan further teaches: wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing an access authorization and compares said access authorization with one of said predefined travel destination and said input travel destination to generate said control signal (column 1, lines 59-62; column 3, line 46 through column 4, line 19 of Tan). There is no discussion of "a predefined travel destination" or "an input travel destination" input at the recognition device by the person.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner cited Hikita et al. (US 6,747,546 B1) as disclosing a data communication transponder and communications system employing it (see Title), and Tiernay et al. (US 7,016,311 B2) as disclosing a multiple protocol transponder (see Title). Applicants reviewed these references and found them to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in the rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

16715